

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

HUONG THI NGUYEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORPORATION OF CATHOLIC
ARCHBISHOP, et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C24-5996 BHS

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Theresa L. Fricke's Report and Recommendation (R&R), Dkt. 10, recommending the Court deny pro se plaintiff Huong Nguyen's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, Dkt. 1, and dismiss without prejudice her proposed complaint, Dkt. 1-1, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a plausible claim. Nguyen's claims relate to a 2013 on the job injury and ensuing workers compensation claim. She seeks to sue her employers' attorneys, other attorneys, and various judges that have apparently already ruled against her in prior litigation arising from the same incident.

1 Nguyen has objected to the R&R, Dkt. 11, but she does not address the basis for
2 the R&R’s proposed dismissal of her claim. She instead reiterates that she was injured
3 and is entitled to compensation, and repeats her claim that various attorneys and judges
4 mishandled her claim.

5 A district judge must determine de novo any part of a magistrate judge’s proposed
6 disposition to which a party has properly objected. It must modify or set aside any portion
7 of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

8 The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition;
9 receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.
10 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). A proper objection requires “specific written objections to the
11 proposed findings and recommendations” in the R&R. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). “[I]n
12 providing for a de novo determination . . . Congress intended to permit whatever reliance
13 a district judge, in the exercise of sound judicial discretion, chose to place on a
14 magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *United States v. Raddatz*, 447
15 U.S. 667, 676 (1980) (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, when a district
16 court adopts a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the district court is required to merely
17 “indicate[] that it reviewed the record de novo, found no merit to . . . [the] objections, and
18 summarily adopt[s] the magistrate judge’s analysis in [the] report and recommendation.”
19 *United States v. Ramos*, 65 F.4th 427, 433 (9th Cir. 2023). In so doing, district courts are
20 “not obligated to explicitly address [the] objections.” *Id.* at 437.

1 The R&R correctly points out that the judicial defendants are entitled to absolute
2 judicial immunity, that Nguyen has failed to identify a federal question over which this
3 Court has subject matter jurisdiction, and has not stated a plausible claim against any
4 defendant. The objections are **OVERRULED**, the R&R is **ADOPTED**, Nguyen's
5 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED**, and the case is **DISMISSED**
6 without prejudice and without leave to amend for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The
7 Clerk shall close the case.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated this 8th day of April, 2025.

10
11 

12 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22